arXiv:1411.5252v1 [hep-ex] 19 Nov 2014

Experimental determination of V_{us} from kaon decays

Matthew Moulson

Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN
Via E. Fermi, 40, 00044 Frascati RM, Italy

During the last few years, new experimental and theoretical results have allowed ever-more-stringent tests of the Standard Model to be performed using kaon decays. This overview of recent progress includes updated results for the evaluation of the CKM matrix element V_{us} and related tests of CKM unitarity from experimental data on kaon decays.

PRESENTED AT

8th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle
(CKM 2014), Vienna, Austria, September 8-12, 2014

1 Introduction

If indeed the W couples to quarks and leptons via a single, universal gauge coupling, then for universality to be observed as the equivalence of the Fermi constant G_F as measured in muon and hadron decays, the CKM matrix must be unitary. Currently, the most stringent test of CKM unitarity is obtained from the first-row relation $V_{ud}^2 + V_{us}^2 + V_{ub}^2 \equiv 1 + \Delta_{\rm CKM}$. During the period spanning 2003 to 2010, a wealth of new measurements of $K_{\ell 3}$ and $K_{\ell 2}$ decays, together with steady theoretical progress, made possible precision tests of the Standard Model (SM) based on this relation. In a 2010 evaluation of V_{us}, the FlaviaNet Working Group on Kaon Decays set bounds on $\Delta_{\rm CKM}$ at the level of 0.1% [1], which translate into bounds on the effective scale of new physics on the order of 10 TeV [2]. Since 2010, there have been a few significant new measurements; the purpose of the present review is to update the FlaviaNet evaluation by including them. During the last four years, there have also been important theoretical developments. Advances in algorithmic sophistication and computing power have lead to a number of new, high-precision lattice QCD estimates of the hadronic constants $f_+(0)$ and f_K/f_π, which enter into the determination of V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ and $K_{\mu 2}$ decays, respectively. The Flavor Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG), whose members include representatives from the major lattice collaborations, provides synthesis of the results of lattice calculations in the form of a biannual review. The most recent edition [3] is a useful source for the recommended values of the lattice constants entering into the evaluation of V_{us}. Theoretical issues and updates since the FLAG review were also summarized at this conference [4].

2 New experimental inputs

2.1 Branching ratios and lifetimes

The experimental inputs for the determination of V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays are the rates and form factors for the decays of both charged and neutral kaons. Existing data allow V_{us} to be evaluated from the rates for the K_{e3} decays of the K_S, K_L, and $K^\pm$, and for the $K_{\mu 3}$ decays of the K_L and K^+. Because the best values for the leptonic and semileptonic decay rates are obtained from fits to the branching ratio (BR) and lifetime measurements for all decay modes with appreciable BRs, any new BR measurements are potentially interesting inputs to the analysis.

Since the 2010 review, there have been two new measurements of the K_S lifetime, τ_{K_S}: one from KLOE, from the vertex distribution for $K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$ decays in $e^+e^- \to \phi \to K_S K_L$ events [5], and one from KTeV, from a comprehensive reanalysis of the experiment's data set to obtain a new value for ${\rm Re}\,\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ [6]. The KTeV analysis can be performed with or without assuming CPT symmetry; the present update makes use of the results obtained without the CPT assumption. The largest effect of these

Parameter	Value	S
BR($\mu\nu$)	63.58(11)%	1.1
BR($\pi\pi^0$)	20.64(7)%	1.1
BR($\pi\pi^+\pi^-$)	5.56(4)%	1.0
BR($\pi^0 e\nu$)	5.088(27)%	1.2
BR($\pi^0\mu\nu$)	3.366(30)%	1.9
BR($\pi\pi^0\pi^0$)	1.764(25)%	1.0
$\tau_{K^\pm}$	12.384(15) ns	1.2

Table 1: Complete results of updated fit to $K^\pm$ BR and lifetime measurements. Scale factors are calculated using the PDG prescription [9].

updates on the K_S fit is to reduce the uncertainty on τ_{K_S}, the value of which changes from 89.59(6) ps [1] to 89.58(4) ps. The result for BR(K_{Se3}) from the K_S fit is essentially determined by the KLOE result for BR(K_{Se3})/BR($K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-$) [7].

There have been no new K_L branching ratio measurements since the 2010 review, but, as noted above, KTeV has a new value for $\mathrm{Re}\,\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$. For the present analysis, this result is averaged with the 2002 result from NA48 [8] to provide an effective measurement of BR($K_L \to \pi^0\pi^0$)/BR($K_L \to \pi^+\pi^-$) obtained without assuming CPT symmetry. This is now used in the K_L fit in place of the PDG ETAFIT result. The K_L fit results from the 2010 review are essentially unchanged. The consistency of the input data is generally poor—the fit gives $\chi^2/\mathrm{ndf} = 19.8/12$ ($P = 7.0\%$).

A new measurement of BR($K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$) from KLOE-2 [10] fills a significant gap in the $K^\pm$ data set. For the 2010 review, the only constraint in the $K^\pm$ fit on the value of BR($K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$) was from a 1965 bubble-chamber measurement with a 3% uncertainty [11] that was slated for removal upon the availability of a new measurement with a thorough evaluation of systematic errors. The $K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ decay is not easy to reconstruct at KLOE because of the low momentum of the pion tracks. Nevertheless, KLOE-2 obtains a result with an overall precision of 0.7%: BR($K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$) $= 0.005565(31)_{\mathrm{stat}}(25)_{\mathrm{sys}}$. This result is claimed to be fully inclusive of radiation, but the radiative corrections are handled somewhat differently than in earlier KLOE analyses. The inclusion of this measurement in place of the measurement from [11] significantly reduces the uncertainty on the fit result for BR($K^\pm_{\mu 2}$), as suggested by the large correlation ($\rho = -0.75$) in the previous fit between the values for BR($K^\pm_{\mu 2}$) and BR($K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$).

The updated fit to 6 BRs and the $K^\pm$ lifetime uses 17 input measurements, has 1 constraint, and gives $\chi^2/\mathrm{ndf} = 25.5/11$ ($P = 0.78\%$). The full results of the fit are listed in Table 1. The poor χ^2 value is largely the result of the large residuals for the KLOE BR measurements for $K^\pm_{e3}$ and $K^\pm_{\mu 3}$ (-2.3σ and -3.4σ, respectively). For comparison, the current PDG fit [9] to 7 BRs and the $K^\pm$ lifetime uses several of the



Figure 1: 1σ confidence contours for form factor parameters (K_{e3}-$K_{\mu 3}$ averages) from dispersive fits, for different experiments. The NA48/2 result was converted by the author from the experiment's polynomial fit results. The FlaviaNet 2010 average and the new average, with the NA48/2 result included, are also shown.

older measurements not used in the present analysis (32 measurements in all), and gives $\chi^2/\text{ndf} = 51.8/25$ ($P = 0.13\%$).

Recently, the ISTRA+ experiment at Protvino has published a result for the ratio $\text{BR}(K^-_{e3})/\text{BR}(\pi\pi^0)$ from the analysis of data taken in 2001 [12]. The sample of K_{e3} events is claimed to be inclusive of inner bremsstrahlung (IB). However, radiative events are not generated in the simulation used to calculate the acceptance, so there is some uncertainty as to how inclusive the measurement is. In part, this is taken into account in the evaluation of the systematic uncertainties via variation of the angular cut used to accept a possible IB photon. This measurement is not yet included in the evaluation of $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$. The effect of including it in the fit to $K^\pm$ rate data is to change the result for $\text{BR}(K_{e3})$ from 5.088(27)% to 5.083(27)%, with a similar effect on $\text{BR}(K_{\mu 3})$, and negligible effects on the other BRs and on the fit quality.

2.2 Form factor parameters

In 2012, the NA48/2 experiment released preliminary results for the form factors for both $K^\pm_{e3}$ and $K^\pm_{\mu 3}$ decays [13]. The fits were performed using one of two parameterizations,

- polynomial: $(\lambda'_+, \lambda''_+)$ for K_{e3}, $(\lambda'_+, \lambda''_+, \lambda_0)$ for $K_{\mu 3}$, or

			Approx contrib to % err			
Mode	$V_{us}\, f_+(0)$	% err	BR	τ	Δ	I
$K_{L\,e3}$	0.2163(6)	0.26	0.09	0.20	0.11	0.05
$K_{L\,\mu3}$	0.2166(6)	0.28	0.15	0.18	0.11	0.06
$K_{S\,e3}$	0.2155(13)	0.61	0.60	0.02	0.11	0.05
$K^{\pm}_{e3}$	0.2172(8)	0.36	0.27	0.06	0.23	0.05
$K^{\pm}_{\mu3}$	0.2170(11)	0.51	0.45	0.06	0.23	0.06

Table 2: Values of $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ from data for different decay modes, with breakdown of uncertainty from different sources: branching ratio measurements (BR), lifetime measurements (τ), long distance radiative and isospin-breaking corrections (Δ), and phase space integrals from form factor parameters (I).

- polar: M_V for K_{e3}, (M_V, M_S) for $K_{\mu3}$.

The FlaviaNet Working Group uses the dispersive parameterizations of [14] because of the advantages described in [1]. NA48/2 has not performed dispersive fits. However, it is possible to obtain approximately equivalent values of Λ_+ and $\ln C$ from a fit to the NA48/2 measurements of $(\lambda'_+, \lambda''_+, \lambda_0)$ using the expressions in the appendix of [14] and the observation that $\lambda_0 \approx \lambda'_0 + 3.5\lambda''_0$ [15]. This is important because it helps to resolve a controversy: the older measurements of the $K_{\mu3}$ form factors for K_L decays from NA48 [16] are in such strong disagreement with the other existing measurements that they were excluded from the FlaviaNet averages [1]. The new NA48/2 measurements, on the other hand, are in good agreement with other measurements, as seen from Fig. 1. Including the new NA48/2 results, appropriately converted for the current purposes, the dispersive average becomes $\Lambda_+ = (25.75 \pm 0.36) \times 10^{-3}$, $\ln C = 0.1985(70)$, with $\rho = -0.202$ and $P(\chi^2) = 55\%$. The central values of the phase space integrals barely change with this inclusion; the uncertainties are reduced by 30%.

The OKA experiment at Protvino is the successor to ISTRA+. Recently, OKA presented preliminary results on the K_{e3} form factor parameters from polynomial, pole, and dispersive fits, obtained with a sample of 6M K^+ decays [17]. The results are significantly more precise than the ISTRA+ results [18] and are in agreement with ISTRA+ and the other experiments. The OKA results will be included in the averages for the form factor parameters in a future update, once the systematic uncertainties have been evaluated.

Choice of $f_+(0)$		V_{us}	$\Delta_{\rm CKM}$	
$N_f = 2+1$	0.9661(32)	0.2241(9)	−0.0008(6)	-1.4σ
$N_f = 2+1+1$	0.9704(32)	0.2232(9)	−0.0012(6)	-2.1σ

Table 3: Results for V_{us} and first-row unitarity test from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays.

3 Evaluation of V_{us} and related tests

The evaluations of $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ for each of the five decay modes ($K_{L\,e3}$, $K_{L\,\mu 3}$, $K_{S\,e3}$, $K^\pm_{e3}$, and $K^\pm_{\mu 3}$) are presented in Table 2, with a breakdown of the uncertainties from different sources in each case. The updated five-channel average is $V_{us}\, f_+(0) = 0.2165(4)$ with $\chi^2/\text{ndf} = 1.61/4$ ($P = 81\%$).

In the 2010 review, $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ was 0.2163(5), so the fractional uncertainty has been reduced from 0.23% to 0.18%. Careful comparison of Table 2 with the corresponding table in [1], however, reveals that all of the efforts described in Section 2 contribute only marginally to this progress. The modes for which the evaluation of $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ is most improved are $K^\pm_{e3}$ (0.2160(11) → 0.2172(8)) and $K^\pm_{\mu 3}$ (0.2158(14) → 0.2170(11)). The $\sim 1\sigma$ shift and reduction of the uncertainty in both cases is due to a new evaluation of the correction for strong isospin breaking, $\Delta_{SU(2)}$. The correction used in this analysis is $\Delta_{SU(2)} = (2.43 \pm 0.20)\%$, which was calculated using the $N_f = 2+1$ FLAG averages for the quark-mass ratios $Q = 22.6(7)(6)$ and $m_s/\hat{m} = 27.46(15)(41)$ with the isospin-limit meson masses $M_K = 494.2$ MeV and $M_\pi = 134.8$ MeV [3] (see [19] for discussion and notation). The 2010 review used the result from the chiral perturbation theory analysis of information on light quark masses, $\Delta_{SU(2)} = (2.9 \pm 0.4)\%$ [20]; the uncertainty on this value was a leading contribution to the uncertainty on $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ from the charged-kaon modes. The strong isospin-breaking correction is still a significant source of uncertainty for these modes; the value of $\Delta_{SU(2)}$ used here should be confirmed and improved upon. Perfect equality of the uncorrected results for $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ from charged and neutral modes would require $\Delta_{SU(2)} = 2.83(38)\%$.

A value for $f_+(0)$ is needed to obtain the value of V_{us}. As lattice calculations improve to include more dynamical flavors, smaller pion masses, and better systematics, there is some suggestion that the results for $f_+(0)$ are increasing (in particular, see Fig. 4 of [3]). For this review, separate reference values are used for $N_f = 2+1$ and $N_f = 2+1+1$. For $N_f = 2+1$, the uncorrelated FLAG average of the results from the RBC/UKQCD [21] and Fermilab/MILC [22] collaborations is $f_+(0) = 0.9661(32)$. For $N_f = 2+1+1$ the recommended FLAG value is a recently published result from Fermilab/MILC: $f_+(0) = 0.9704(32)$ [23]. Both values are significantly higher and more precise than the reference value used in the 2010 review: $f_+(0) = 0.959(5)$.

The test of CKM unitarity requires a value for $|V_{ud}|$. The survey of experimental data on $0^+ \to 0^+$ β decays from Hardy and Towner [24] has been recently updated

Choice of $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$		V_{us}/V_{ud}	$\Delta_{\rm CKM}$	
$N_f = 2+1$	1.192(5)	0.2315(10)	−0.0001(6)	-0.2σ
$N_f = 2+1+1$	1.1960(25)	0.2308(6)	−0.0004(5)	-0.9σ

Table 4: Results for V_{us}/V_{ud} and first-row unitarity test from $K_{\mu 2}$ decays.

with 24 new measurements; after a critical review of inner-bremsstrahlung correction schemes [25], some results have also been rejected. The new survey gives $V_{ud} = 0.97417(21)$ [26]. The results for V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays with $N_f = 2+1$ and $N_f = 2+1+1$ lattice values for $f_+(0)$ and the latest value of V_{ud} are all listed in Table 3. Because of the increase in the results for $f_+(0)$, the previously excellent agreement with the expectation from first-row unitarity is no longer observed: $\Delta_{\rm CKM}$ is different from zero by -1.4σ and -2.1σ when the $N_f = 2+1$ and $N_f = 2+1+1$ results for $f_+(0)$ are used, respectively.

Up to kinematic factors and long-distance electromagnetic corrections, the ratio of the (inner-bremsstrahlung inclusive) rates for $K_{\mu 2}$ and $\pi_{\mu 2}$ decays provides access to the quantity $V_{us}/V_{ud} \times f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$. Note that the quantity $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ includes the effects of strong isospin breaking. Some lattice collaborations make an appropriate choice of the physical point for the chiral extrapolation and quote $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ directly, while others quote f_K/f_π, i.e., the ratio in the $SU(2)$ limit. In the latter cases, FLAG now applies corrections for strong isospin breaking to each result to produce the averages for $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$. This is a substantial improvement with respect to the situation in 2010, at which time the effects of strong isospin breaking were not yet taken into account.*

Compared to the 2010 value, the value for $\mathrm{BR}(K^\pm_{\mu 2})$ in Table 1 has slightly increased and its uncertainty has been reduced from 0.3% to 0.2%, leading to the new result $V_{us}/V_{ud} \times f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm} = 0.2760(4)$. For the lattice value of $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$, once again, a distinction is made between results for $N_f = 2+1$ and $N_f = 2+1+1$. The $N_f = 2+1$ FLAG average of four complete and published determinations of $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ is 1.192(5) [3]. For $N_f = 2+1+1$, there are two results entering into the FLAG value: from MILC [29] and HPQCD [30]. For their result, MILC generated staggered-quark ensembles with quark masses down to physical values. The HPQCD result is based on an alternative analysis of the MILC ensembles with independent methodology, leading to much smaller uncertainties. For $N_f = 2+1+1$, FLAG recommends the value $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm} = 1.194(5)$, which covers both results; the uncertainty quoted is similar to that for the MILC result. After the cutoff for the FLAG review, the Fermilab/MILC

* Strong isospin breaking was taken into account for the CKM 2012 update [27] of the FlaviaNet 2010 review. The available lattice averages were for f_K/f_π; corrections from [28] were made to the ratio of $K_{\mu 2}$ to $\pi_{\mu 2}$ rates for both long-distance electromagnetic effects and strong isospin breaking; and the experimental quantity quoted was $V_{us}/V_{ud} \times f_K/f_\pi$. In contrast, for the present determination of $V_{us}/V_{ud} \times f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$, only the electromagnetic correction of [28] is applied.

	$N_f = 2+1$	$N_f = 2+1+1$
V_{ud}	0.97416(21)	0.97415(21)
V_{us}	0.2248(7)	0.2243(5)
χ^2/ndf	1.16/1 (28.1%)	2.64/1 (10.4%)
$\Delta_{\rm CKM}$	$-0.0005(5)$ (-1.0σ)	$-0.0007(5)$ (-1.5σ)

Table 5: Results of fits to V_{ud} from $0^+ \to 0^+$ β decays, V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays, and V_{us}/V_{ud} from $K_{\mu 2}$ decays shown in Figure 2.

collaboration published a study [31] updating the MILC result of [29], using many of the same ensembles. This new result has an error budget similar to that for the HPQCD result. It is not straightforward to combine the results for $N_f = 2+1+1$. For the purposes of this review, $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm} = 1.1960(25)$ is used, where this representative value is essentially the symmetrization of the result from [31]. The results for V_{us}/V_{ud} and the first-row unitarity test from $K^\pm_{\mu 2}$ decays, obtained with the $N_f = 2+1$ and $N_f = 2+1+1$ lattice values for $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ and V_{ud} from [26], are presented in Table 4.

The $K^\pm_{\mu 2}$ data and lattice results for $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ show better agreement with first-row unitarity than do the $K_{\ell 3}$ data and lattice results for $f_+(0)$. It is difficult to ascribe any significance to this difference at present, but assuming for a moment that it points to a problem in the data set or the lattice calculations for $K_{\ell 3}$, it would be useful to have additional tests to help identify the problem. Once such test might be provided by the Callan-Treiman relation, which links the value of the scalar form factor at the unphysical point $t_{\rm CT} = m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ to the ratio of f_K/f_π to $f_+(0)$ [32, 33]. Since $f_0(t_{\rm CT})$ is given by the form factor parameter C (see Section 2.2), the test provides a way to gauge the consistency of the value of $f_+(0)$ with the $K_{\mu 3}$ slope measurements, assuming the validity of the value for f_K/f_π.[†] The test gives $f_+(0) = 0.980(10)$. Comparison with the lattice values of $f_+(0)$ in Table 3 suggests that higher values of $f_+(0)$ are not inconsistent with the $K_{\mu 3}$ form factor parameters. This test does not use the experimental information on the $K_{\ell 3}$ rates.

The values of V_{ud} from $0^+ \to 0^+$ β decays, V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays, and V_{us}/V_{ud} from $K_{\mu 2}$ decays can be combined in a single fit to increase the sensitivity of the unitarity test, as illustrated in Fig. 2. The fit can be performed with or without the unitarity constraint, $\Delta_{\rm CKM} = 0$. The unconstrained fits give the results listed in Table 5. These fits give $\Delta_{\rm CKM} = -0.0005(5)$ (-1.0σ) for the analysis using $N_f = 2+1$ lattice results, and $\Delta_{\rm CKM} = -0.0007(5)$ (-1.5σ) for the analysis using $N_f = 2+1+1$ results. The corresponding result in 2010 (for $N_f = 2+1$) was $V_{us} = 0.2253(9)$ and $\Delta_{\rm CKM} = -0.0001(6)$. The decreased consistency with the first-row unitarity

[†]Here, the $N_f = 2+1+1$ value for $f_{K^\pm}/f_{pi^\pm}$ is corrected to $f_K/f_\pi = 1.1986(25)$ in the isospin limit.



Figure 2: Fits to V_{ud} from $0^+ \to 0^+$ β decays, V_{us} from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays, and V_{us}/V_{ud} from $K_{\mu 2}$ decays, with lattice values of $f_+(0)$ and $f_{K^\pm}/f_{\pi^\pm}$ from $N_f = 2+1$ (left) and $N_f = 2+1+1$ (right). The yellow ellipses indicate the 1σ confidence intervals in the plane of (V_{ud}, V_{us}) for the fits with with no constraints. The yellow line segments indicate the results obtained with the constraint $\Delta_{\rm CKM} = 0$.

hypothesis is almost entirely due to the changes in the lattice results for $f_+(0)$. All new experimental results combined have a marginal effect on the results of the unitarity test, and good agreement with unitarity is still observed for $K_{\mu 2}$ decays.

While it would be premature to claim that the unitarity residuals for $K_{\ell 3}$ are significant, the question arises: are hidden systematics in the data and calculations becoming important as the stated uncertainties shrink? If so, are they mainly in the data or the lattice calculations? Technical and technological advances in lattice computing have made it possible to evaluate systematics with increasing thoroughness, and the Callan-Treiman test favors larger values of $f_+(0)$. Meanwhile, the consistency of the fits to $K_{\ell 3}$ rate data is creaky. Yet, the errors on the BRs from these fits are scaled to reflect internal inconsistencies, and after this procedure, the values of $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ from K_L, K_S, and $K^\pm$ modes show good agreement. There is also a fair amount of redundancy in the $K_{\ell 3}$ data set, and adding or eliminating single measurements doesn't change the results for $V_{us}\, f_+(0)$ by much.

At present, V_{us} is known to nearly 0.2%. The dominating uncertainties are from the lattice results rather than experiment, but not by much. Within the next decade, the uncertainties on the lattice averages for $f_+(0)$ and f_K/f_π will be decreased, perhaps down to the 0.1% level [34]. If this can be achieved, there will be a demand for BR and lifetime measurements for K_L, K_S, and $K^\pm$ with matching precision. The experimental parameters that currently contribute more than 0.1% to the uncertainty

on V_{us} evaluated for a single mode are the K_L lifetime and the BRs for K_{Se3} and $K^{\pm}_{\ell 3}$ decays. In order to be useful, better BR($K^{\pm}_{\ell 3}$) measurements would also require a more precise evaluation of $\Delta_{SU(2)}$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to warmly thank P. de Simone, V. Duk, E. Gámiz, J. Hardy, and I. Towner for useful discussions and comments on this manuscript.

References

[1] FlaviaNet Kaon Working Group, M. Antonelli, et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 69 (2010) 399.

[2] V. Cirigliano, J. Jenkins, M. González-Alonso, Nucl. Phys. B 830 (2010) 95.

[3] FLAG Working Group, S. Aoki, et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 74 (2014) 2890.

[4] N. Garron, presentation at CKM 2014: 8th Int. Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle (Vienna, Austria, 8 September 2014).

[5] KLOE Collaboration, F. Ambrosino, et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 71 (2011) 1604.

[6] KTeV Collaboration, E. Abouzaid, et al., Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011) 092001.

[7] KLOE Collaboration, F. Ambrosino, et al., Phys. Lett. B 636 (2006) 173.

[8] NA48 Collaboration, J. Batley, et al., Phys. Lett. B 544 (2002) 97.

[9] Particle Data Group, K. Olive, et al., Review of particle properties, Chinese Physics C 38.

[10] KLOE/KLOE-2 Collaboration, D. Babusci, et al., Phys. Lett. B 738 (2014) 128.

[11] V. Bisi, et al., Nuovo Cim. 35 (1965) 768.

[12] V. Uvarov, et al., Phys. Atom. Nucl. 77 (2014) 725.

[13] R. Wanke for the NA62 Collaboration, in: Proc. 11th Int. Conf. on Heavy Quarks and Leptons (HQL 2012), Prague, 2012, PoS(HQL2012)007.

[14] V. Bernard, et al., Phys. Rev. D 80 (2009) 034034.

[15] KLOE Collaboration, F. Ambrosino, et al., JHEP 0712 (2007) 105.

[16] NA48 Collaboration, A. Lai, et al., Phys. Lett. B 647 (2007) 341.

[17] V. Obraztsov for the OKA Collaboration, presentation at ICHEP 2014: 37th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics (Valencia, Spain, 5 July 2014).

[18] O. Yushchenko, et al., Phys. Lett. B 589 (2004) 111–117.

[19] V. Cirigliano, et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 84 (2012) 399.

[20] A. Kastner, H. Neufeld, Eur. Phys. J. C 57 (2008) 541.

[21] RBC and UKQCD Collaborations, P. Boyle, et al., JHEP 1308 (2013) 0132.

[22] Fermilab Lattice and MILC Collaborations, A. Bazavov, et al., Phys. Rev. D 87 (2013) 073012.

[23] Fermilab Lattice and MILC Collaborations, A. Bazavov, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 112 (2014) 112001.

[24] J. Hardy, I. Towner, Phys. Rev. C 79 (2009) 055502.

[25] I. Towner, J. Hardy, Phys. Rev. C 82 (2010) 065501.

[26] J. Hardy, I. Towner, in preparation.

[27] M. Moulson, in: Proc. 7th Int. Workshop on CKM Unitarity Triangle (CKM '12), Cincinnati OH, USA, 2012, arXiv:1301.3046.

[28] V. Cirigliano, H. Neufeld, Phys. Lett. B 700 (2011) 7.

[29] MILC Collaboration, A. Bazavov, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 172003.

[30] HPQCD Collaboration, R. Dowdall, et al., Phys. Rev. D 88 (2013) 074504.

[31] Fermilab Lattice and MILC Collaborations, A. Bazavov, et al., Phys. Rev. D 90 (2014) 074509.

[32] C. Callan, S. Treiman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 16 (1966) 153.

[33] J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B 250 (1985) 517–538.

[34] C. Tarantino, presentation at LTS1 2014: Workshop on the Long-Term Strategy of INFN-CSN1 (Elba, Italy, 22 May 2014).